United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/30/DEU/2

General Assembly

Distr.: General
12 March 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirtieth session
7–18 May 2018

Compilation on Germany

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a compilation of information contained in reports of treaty bodies and special procedures and other relevant United Nations documents, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies

2. In 2017, 2015 and 2014, respectively, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Committee on the Rights of the Child encouraged Germany to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.[1] In 2017, the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent recommended that Germany ratify the Convention.[2]

3. The same Working Group and the Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that Germany ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.[3]

4. Germany made regular voluntary contributions to support the work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and to trust funds administered by the Office.[4]

III. National human rights framework

5. The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent recommended that Germany adopt legislation to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and that it amend the General Equal Treatment Act to include structural racial discrimination committed by the State.[5]

GE.18-03749(E)
1803749

Please recycle

6. The same Working Group recommended that Germany expand the mandate of the German Institute for Human Rights to include the reception of complaints of human rights violations committed by agents of the State.[8]

7. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern about the use of arms exported by Germany, including in conflict zones, and the inadequate monitoring by arms-producing corporations of the use of their arms in the context of violence against women, in line with its obligations under the Arms Trade Treaty. It was also concerned that the small arms principles did not mention gender-based violence as a ground for denying an export licence and recommended that German legislation regulating arms export control be harmonized in line with article 7 (4) of the Arms Trade Treaty and the Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP of the European Union. It also recommended that, before export licences were granted, comprehensive and transparent assessments be conducted of the impact that the misuse of small arms and light weapons would have on women, including those living in conflict zones.[9]

IV. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

A. Cross-cutting issues

1. Equality and non-discrimination[10]

8. The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent recommended that Germany implement the National Action Plan against Racism, with a focus on eliminating structural racial discrimination in all spheres.[11]

9. While noting the justified concerns of Germany and the action it had taken to combat anti-Semitism, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned that Germany was not adequately addressing other forms of racial discrimination, including institutional racism against Muslims. It was also concerned at the discrimination experienced by women from minority groups and the intersection between discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and racial discrimination.[12] The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent was concerned about the human rights situation of people of African descent, whose lives were marked by racism but who were not officially recognized as a group particularly exposed to racism.[13]

10. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern that the General Act on Equal Treatment (2006) remained limited in scope and failed to protect women comprehensively from gender-based discrimination.[14] Furthermore, it expressed concern at the absence of a comprehensive national gender equality strategy, policy or action plan to address the structural factors perpetuating gender inequalities.[15]

11. The same Committee called for the realization of substantive gender equality, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, throughout the process of implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.[16]

12. The Committee expressed concern that stereotyped and sexualized images of women continued to appear in the media and advertisements and that stereotyped media portrayals and negative images of ethnic minority women and migrant women undermined their ability to better integrate into society.[17]

13. The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent found that racial profiling by police officials was endemic.[18] It called for effective action against and cessation of any practice of racial profiling by federal and State law enforcement officials. Such action might include amending or repealing section 22 (1) of the Federal Police Act and legally prohibiting discriminatory profiling; establishing independent complaints mechanisms at both the federal and State levels to investigate acts of racial discrimination committed by law enforcement officials; adopting a comprehensive training strategy and vetting system for application during recruitment and throughout the career of law enforcement officials to ensure that law enforcement tasks were performed without racial

profiling or any other methods leading to racial discrimination; and providing specialized training to prosecutors and judges in identifying and characterizing racist hate crimes.[19]

14. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned that the absence of a statutory definition of racial discrimination in line with article 1 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in its domestic legislation had direct implications on the failure of Germany to address adequately racial discrimination against all groups requiring protection under the Convention.[20]

15. The same Committee was greatly concerned about the proliferation and dissemination of racist ideas by certain political parties and movements and the lack of efficient measures that had been taken to sanction strongly and deter such discourses and behaviours. It was concerned that such discourses might promote racially motivated acts, including violence, against groups protected under the Convention. It recommended that Germany increase its efforts and use all possible means to counter and stem the tide of racism, in particular by strongly condemning all racist statements by political leaders, public authorities and public figures, including through the institution of criminal proceedings.[21]

2. Development, the environment, and business and human rights[22]

16. The Committee on the Rights of the Child noted that Germany used a significant amount of coal to produce power and expressed concern about the negative impact of coal emissions on children's health. It recommended that Germany establish a clear regulatory framework for the industries operating in Germany to ensure that their activities did not negatively affect human rights or endanger environmental and other standards, especially those relating to children's rights.[23]

17. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern about the negative impact of the conduct of transnational companies registered or domiciled in Germany and operating abroad on the rights of women and girls in third countries. It recommended that Germany strengthen its legislation governing the conduct of those corporations in relation to their activities abroad, including by requiring them to conduct human rights and gender impact assessments before making investment decisions.[24] It also recommended that it introduce effective mechanisms to investigate complaints filed against those corporations, with a mandate to, among other things, receive complaints and conduct independent investigations.[25]

18. The Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed concern about the lack of adequate measures taken by Germany against German companies that conducted business abroad and reportedly violated children's rights and other human rights. It recommended that Germany examine and adapt its civil, criminal and administrative legislative framework to ensure that business enterprises and their subsidiaries operating in or managed from the German territory were legally accountable for any violations of children's rights and human rights.[26]

19. The same Committee encouraged Germany to ensure that the realization of children's rights became a top priority in the international cooperation agreements established with developing countries.[27]

B. Civil and political rights

1. Right to life, liberty and security of person[28]

20. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was deeply concerned that Germany did not recognize the use of physical and chemical restraints, solitary confinement and other harmful practices as acts of torture. The Committee was further concerned about the use of physical and chemical restraints on persons with psychosocial disabilities in institutions and on older persons in residential care. It recommended, inter alia, that Germany prohibit the use of such physical and chemical restraints and consider compensation for the victims of those practices.[29]

21. In 2013, the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment recommended that Germany ensure that the national preventive mechanisms cooperated with the other mechanisms that monitored places of deprivation of liberty in order to seek possible synergies, including in the context of monitoring houses for the elderly.[30]

22. In 2015, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention expressed concern about the number of persons detained in post-conviction preventative detention and the duration and conditions of such detention.[31] Responsibility for the execution of preventive detention lay with the Länder. States must exercise caution and provide appropriate guarantees in evaluating future dangers.[32] Preventative detention should be a last resort and regular periodic reviews by an independent body must be made to determine whether continued detention was justified.[33] The conditions for detainees held in preventative detention must be distinct from conditions for convicted prisoners serving a punitive sentence and must be aimed at the detainees' rehabilitation and reintegration into society.[34]

23. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned about incidents of hate crimes and attacks on refugees and asylum seekers in shelters and camps, causing injury to women and girls. It recommended that Germany investigate promptly any incidents of hate crimes or attacks against refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls and ensure that the perpetrators were duly prosecuted.[35]

24. While noting the acknowledgment by Germany of the difficulty experienced in effectively investigating the murders committed by the National Socialist Underground, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination remained concerned about the continued failure to recognize systemic shortcomings in identifying and addressing the racial motivation behind such acts, which might mask institutional racism.[36]

25. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities expressed concern about the widespread practice of involuntary placement of persons with psychosocial disabilities in institutions, the lack of protection of their privacy and the lack of data on their situation. The Committee recommended that Germany prohibit involuntary placement and promote alternative measures.[37]

26. The same Committee was concerned about the use of compulsory and involuntary treatment, particularly for persons with psychosocial disabilities in institutions and older persons in residential care, and the lack of data on involuntary placement and treatment. It was also concerned by the practice of forced sterilization and coercive abortions for adults with disabilities on the basis of substituted consent. It was further concerned by the fact that the bodily integrity of intersex children was not upheld. It recommended that Germany repeal section 1905 of the Civil Code, explicitly prohibit in law sterilization without the full and informed consent of the individual concerned and eliminate all exceptions, including those based upon substituted consent or court approval. The Committee also recommended that Germany ensure all psychiatric treatments and services were always delivered with the free and informed consent of the individual concerned and that it conduct an investigation into human rights violations in psychiatric and older persons' care settings in all Länder.[38]

27. The Committee on Enforced Disappearances noted that Germany was prepared to accept diplomatic assurances to rule out factors, specific to the State and person concerned, that might prevent deportation. It recommended that Germany adopt all the measures necessary to ensure that those diplomatic assurances were effectively evaluated and were not accepted in cases where there were substantial grounds for believing that the person concerned would be in danger of being subjected to enforced disappearance.[39]

2. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[40]

28. The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent welcomed the adoption of the amendment to section 46 of the Criminal Code requiring the consideration of racist motivation as a specific aggravating circumstance when sentencing offenders.[41]

29. The same Working Group recommended that Germany recall its role in the history of colonization, enslavement, exploitation and genocide of Africans and make reparations to address the continued impact of those acts.[42] While noting that Germany had apologized

for the genocide of the Ovaherero and Nama peoples and was conducting targeted development projects in Namibia,[43] the Working Group recommended that Germany ensure those peoples were included in the negotiations that were ongoing between the Governments of Germany and Namibia.[44]

30. The Working Group called for an independent inquiry into the events that had led to the death of Oury Jalloh while in custody and the prosecution of those responsible.[45]

31. The Working Group on Arbitrary Detention noted that data on police violence had shown a discrepancy between the number of criminal proceedings and the number of convictions, which had been attributed to an increased reluctance on the part of officers to incriminate their colleagues, as well as to the difficulty of proving such offences. It recommended that Germany ensure independent, impartial and effective investigation and prosecution in cases of alleged police violence and that the Länder consider the model of independent special commissions, such as that established in Hamburg, which constituted best practice.[46]

32. The same Working Group expressed concern that, with the exception of the police forces in Berlin and Brandenburg, police officers were not obliged to wear identification badges showing their name or number during the exercise of their functions. Even in those two Länder, the obligation to wear a badge could be withdrawn in order to protect the safety and security of the police officers. The Working Group took note of a study commissioned by the Berlin Police that reflected that about 10 per cent of cases of alleged ill-treatment by police officers could not be investigated or prosecuted because the officers allegedly involved had not been wearing any identification. It recommended that Germany ensure that members of the police that were on duty in all Länder were identifiable.[47]

33. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities expressed concern about the lack of structures and procedural accommodation within the justice sector for assistance to persons with disabilities, particularly girls who were victims of violence and abuse; the inaccessibility of judicial facilities and lack of understanding of legal professionals with regard to access to justice; and the lack of implementation and enforcement by the judiciary of the standards of the Convention in the national legal system and within court rulings. It recommended that Germany introduce legislative reforms so that the criminal, civil, labour and administrative procedures included the requirement to ensure procedural accommodations for persons with disabilities, taking into particular account persons with intellectual or psychosocial disabilities, deaf-blind persons and children with disabilities. It also recommended that Germany ensure effective training of personnel in the justice, police and prison sectors on the application of human rights standards in relation to persons with disabilities.[48]

3. Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[49]

34. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) noted that defamation was a criminal offence under sections 186–188 of the Criminal Code. It called for Germany to decriminalize defamation and incorporate defamation into the Civil Code in accordance with international standards.[50]

35. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women remained concerned that structural barriers and discriminatory stereotypes relating to women's engagement in political and public life continued to exclude women from decision-making positions in elected and appointed positions in public office and within political parties, the judiciary and academia.[51]

36. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was concerned that persons with disabilities were not guaranteed meaningful and effective participation in decision-making related to their lives and that accessible communication was insufficient. It recommended that Germany develop frameworks for the inclusive, comprehensive and transparent participation of organizations representing persons with disabilities, including those experiencing intersectional discrimination, regarding the adoption of legislation, policies and programmes for the implementation and monitoring of the Convention.[52]

4. Prohibition of all forms of slavery[53]

37. While welcoming the measures to combat trafficking, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern about the lack of a comprehensive strategy, the low rates of prosecution of trafficking cases, the lack of national guidelines for the identification of victims and the lack of systematically organized and harmonized measures for victims' assistance, rehabilitation and reintegration.[54]

38. The Committee on the Rights of the Child welcomed the measures that had been taken to prevent child sex tourism, such as the joint educational campaign to protect children from sexual exploitation in tourism launched with two other countries, and the development of the Code of Conduct for the Protection of Children from Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism. The Committee urged Germany to encourage travel enterprises to sign the Code of Conduct.[55]

5. Right to privacy and family life[56]

39. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was concerned that Germany did not provide adequate support for parents with disabilities to bring up their children and exercise their parental rights, and to facilitate the adoption of children with disabilities.[57]

C. Economic, social and cultural rights

1. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

40. The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent recommended that Germany provide specific education and training for people of African descent so that they had better job opportunities and that it explore the possibility of affirmative action by way of job quotas. Such opportunities should open up not only the public sector, but also the private sector.[58]

41. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted with concern that the prevailing gender pay gap continued to have a negative impact on the career development of women and their pension benefits. The Committee recommended that Germany strengthen its efforts to eliminate the gender wage gap and ensure women and men had equal opportunities in the labour market.[59]

42. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination expressed concern about reports of discrimination against Muslim women in gaining access to work opportunities. It recommended that Germany strengthen existing measures to improve the integration of ethnic minorities in the labour market and address the structural discrimination they faced.[60]

43. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was concerned about segregation in the labour market, financial disincentives for persons with disabilities that prevented their entry or transition to the open labour market and the fact that segregated, sheltered workshops had failed to prepare workers for or promote transition to the open labour market.[61]

2. Right to social security

44. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women recommended that Germany establish a State compensation scheme to provide redress by supplementing the pensions of women who had divorced while living in the former German Democratic Republic.[62]

3. Right to an adequate standard of living

45. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination reiterated the concerns about possible indirect discrimination on the grounds of ethnic origin arising from section 19 (3) of the General Equal Treatment Act. Under section 19 (3), landlords could refuse to rent apartments to persons applying for accommodation, with a view to creating and maintaining socially stable residential structures and balanced housing estates or balanced

economic, social and cultural conditions. It was also concerned that the Act exempted landlords with fewer than 50 units. It was concerned at reports of de facto ghettoization of some geographical areas, which had disproportionately higher percentages of people of non-German ethnic origin. It requested that Germany undertake prompt, independent and thorough investigations into all cases of discriminatory practices by private actors, including in relation to discriminatory lending practices, hold those responsible to account and provide effective remedies, including appropriate compensation and guarantees of non-repetition.[63]

46. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern that women, particularly single mothers, older women, migrant women and women with disabilities, continued to be disproportionately affected by poverty; that a significant number of parents, predominantly fathers, failed to pay child maintenance; and that access to maintenance advances were often limited and onerous, which was a reason why single-female-headed households were at considerable risk of falling into poverty. It recommended that Germany design a sustainable system of child maintenance payment and introduce a means-tested child allowance along with minimum maintenance payments for children after their parents separated or divorced.[64]

4. Right to health

47. The same Committee remained concerned about the disparities among federal states in gaining access to affordable contraceptives for women living in poverty and recommended that Germany ensure that modern contraceptives were accessible, affordable and available throughout the territory of Germany to all women and girls, in particular those living in poverty and/or in remote areas.[65]

48. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was concerned about barriers to gaining access to health care, particularly for asylum seekers and refugees with disabilities.[66]

49. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned about the difficulty that undocumented migrants had in gaining access to non-emergency health care, while attempts to obtain the documentation necessary for non-emergency health services often led to the claimant being reported to the authorities and subsequently deported. It recommended that Germany consider the repeal or amendment of section 87 of the Residence Act and ensure that undocumented migrants were given the same rights to gain access to the documentation necessary for non-emergency health services without the risk of being reported to the authorities and subsequently deported.[67]

50. The same Committee recommended that Germany ensure access to safe abortion without subjecting women to mandatory counselling and a three-day waiting period, which the World Health Organization had declared to be medically unnecessary, and ensure that such procedures were reimbursed through health insurance.[68]

5. Right to education[69]

51. UNESCO noted that the German Constitution of 1949 (as amended in October 2010), known as the Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*) did not spell out an explicit right to education. Legislation on education fell within the competence of the Länder.[70]

52. UNESCO stated that there was a disproportionately high number of students with migrant backgrounds who dropped out of university during their bachelor studies. It recommended that Germany introduce measures to encourage young people with migrant backgrounds to continue their studies, including measures to reduce socioeconomic inequalities that migrants often faced.[71]

53. UNESCO noted that many German schools had introduced activities for refugee children, including German language lessons, homework tutoring or political education, as well as specific preparatory classes aimed at integrating students with migration backgrounds.[72]

54. UNESCO stated that Germany had a general social inclusion policy to promote equal opportunities but did not have a specific strategy to promote equal opportunities for ethnic minorities, including Sinti and Roma. It recommended that Germany adopt measures

to foster the inclusion in the education system of Sinti and Roma communities and other ethnic minorities.[73]

55. The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent recommended that Germany take measures to address racial discrimination in education and prevent children of African descent from being assigned to lower tracks in a tiered education system, thereby preventing the children from acquiring a university education.[74] It also recommended that it appoint educators of African descent to the commissions of the boards of education that had the responsibility to develop and design school curricula and their contents.[75]

56. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned at reports that the three-tiered education system in Germany, with early selection into separate levels of education, created a bias against students whose mother tongue was not German, led to an overrepresentation of minority students in the lower school stratum and therefore reduced their chances of gaining access to higher studies and employment in Germany. The Committee was also concerned about the high representation of minorities — including Sinti, Roma, persons referred to as "black people" and other intersectional minorities, such as Muslims — in lower level schools and in schools in marginalized areas. The Committee recommended that Germany strengthen its special measures to increase the level of educational attainment of children of ethnic minorities, in particular by preventing their marginalization and reducing dropout rates, and address de facto segregation of ethnic minorities, including Sinti and Roma, in education, taking into account its close relation to discrimination in the fields of housing and employment.[76]

57. The same Committee was concerned that Germany had an education system where the majority of students with disabilities attended segregated special needs schools and recommended that Germany scale down segregated schools to facilitate inclusion and ensure that the law and policies upheld the duty of mainstream schools to enrol children with disabilities with immediate effect if that was their choice.[77]

58. UNESCO stated that because the education system and parts of the public sector — such as the police force and teacher training — fell within the competence of the Länder, human rights education was implemented individually in the different Länder, with their individual curricula. It encouraged Germany to assess the implementation of human rights education in the Länder.[78]

D. Rights of specific persons or groups

1. Women[79]

59. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern about the significant number of girls, often from migrant families, who had undergone or were at risk of being subjected to female genital mutilation and other harmful practices. The Committee recommended that Germany develop awareness-raising campaigns and that it ensure information was readily available to victims of female genital mutilation, that health and social services professionals were sufficiently trained to identify potential victims and that perpetrators were brought to justice.[80] The Committee on the Rights of the Child raised similar concerns.[81]

60. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern about the underreporting of gender-based violence to the police and low prosecution and conviction rates. It recommended that Germany encourage women to report incidents of gender-based violence, including domestic violence, and ensure that cases of violence against women were effectively investigated and perpetrators duly prosecuted.[82]

61. The same Committee recommended that Germany ensure that foreign women were not being forced to remain in an abusive marriage, by facilitating the recognition of their particular hardship and granting them an independent right of residence.[83]

62. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities expressed concern about the insufficient action that had been taken to prevent and combat discrimination against women and girls with disabilities, particularly migrants and refugees. The Committee recommended that Germany implement programmes for women and girls with disabilities,

particularly migrant and refugee women and girls, to eliminate discrimination in all areas of life.[84]

2. Children[85]

63. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned about legislative provisions allowing marriage under the age of 18 years in exceptional cases and recommended that Germany ensure safeguards to protect girls under the age of 18 years who had been allowed to marry.[86]

64. The Committee on the Rights of the Child regretted that insufficient efforts had been made to tackle the root causes that placed children at risk of becoming victims of the offences under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, such as child poverty and discrimination against children from minority groups and unaccompanied migrant and asylum-seeking children.[87]

65. The same Committee noted with concern that some provisions of the Criminal Code that punished crimes under the Optional Protocol, particularly child pornography, protected children up to the age of 14 only. It recommended that Germany ensure that all children under the age of 18 were fully protected.[88]

66. The Committee was concerned about the insufficient measures for the recovery and reintegration of victims of all offences under the Optional Protocol, particularly for boys and unaccompanied children, including the low number of counselling centres for children affected by child pornography or forced labour in Germany.[89]

67. The Committee expressed concern that children with disabilities and children with a migration background continued to face discrimination, particularly in relation to education and health-care services.[90]

3. Persons with disabilities[91]

68. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned about reports that women with disabilities, particularly those in residential institutions, were two to three times more likely to be exposed to violence than other women. The Committee recommended that Germany establish an independent mechanism to monitor cases of violence and abuse in institutions for persons with disabilities, ensuring that such a body was provided with the human, technical and financial resources necessary to implement fully its mandate.[92] The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities raised similar concerns.[93]

69. The same Committee was concerned that current legislation did not contain a definition of reasonable accommodation and that the denial of such accommodation was not considered a form of discrimination. The Committee recommended that Germany develop protection against discrimination for persons with disabilities, including intersectional discrimination, as a comprehensive, cross-cutting right in domestic legislation, including at the Land level, and collect relevant data on case law.[94]

70. The Committee expressed concern about access to the national emergency call system, especially for deaf persons, and the absence of a specific strategy for the inclusion of persons with disabilities in disaster risk reduction and humanitarian relief. The Committee recommended that Germany establish uniform emergency control centres across Germany, including modern protocols for deaf persons.[95]

71. The Committee was concerned that Germany had not acceded to the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired, or Otherwise Print Disabled.[96]

4. Minorities and indigenous peoples[97]

72. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned about the persistent discrimination faced by members of the Sinti and Roma communities regarding access to housing, education, employment and health care, to which current public measures did not adequately respond.[98]

73. The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent stated that people of African descent were not been recognized as a significant minority, deserving specific action, within the German population.[99] The Working Group recommended that Germany recognize under law people of African descent as a minority group.[100]

5. Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[101]

74. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women commended Germany on its significant and generous efforts in receiving high numbers of asylum seekers and refugees forced to flee their countries throughout 2015 and early 2016. The humanitarian leadership and commitment demonstrated by Germany, at a critical moment for refugee protection in Europe, had set an impressive example in terms of credibility, respect for international human rights standards and international protection.[102]

75. The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent recommended that Germany align relevant legislation with international human rights law in order to respect asylum seekers' human rights, including their right to health in all states. Germany should ensure respect for that the human rights of migrant workers, including those who were undocumented, as guaranteed by international human rights law.[103]

76. The Committee on the Rights of the Child welcomed the withdrawal by Germany of its declaration made on article 22 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and noted that it had hosted thousands of asylum-seeking children and refugee children from many countries. However, it remained concerned that the deficiencies in the identification of child soldiers or children who had escaped forced recruitment, as well as the rejection of asylum applications in such cases, prevented an adequate assessment from being made of their protection needs and also prevented them from receiving the appropriate attention.[104]

77. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned that refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls had limited access to integration and language courses, which were accessible only to those refugees with prospects of remaining in Germany and/or recognized refugees.[105]

78. The Working Group on Arbitrary Detention recommend that Germany revise its Asylum Procedure Act to extend the one-week time limit to challenge an order for deportation and submit a legal remedy and to allow suspensive orders in case of transfers of asylum seekers to any State bound by the Dublin II Regulation. Deportation should not be permissible before a court decision was handed down.[106]

79. The same Working Group recommended that Germany guarantee access to independent, qualified and free-of-charge counselling for asylum seekers before hearings, as well as legal aid after a negative decision.[107]

80. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination remained concerned about the increase in violent attacks targeting asylum seekers and so-called tolerated migrants who were, by law, restricted in their freedom of movement and were often compelled to remain in shared accommodation structures, which increased their vulnerability to human rights violations.[108]

6. Stateless persons[109]

81. The Committee on the Rights of the Child welcomed the developments in Germany in terms of birth registration of all national and foreign children, including children of refugees and asylum seekers. However, it was concerned about the remaining practical difficulties in obtaining birth certificates for newborn babies with irregular residence status, given that the registry officials responsible for issuing the certificates were required to check residence status and communicate their findings to the immigration authorities.[110]

Notes

[1] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.1–124.24, 124.26, 124.30, 124.49 and 124.63.
[2] See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, para. 54; CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 22; and CRC/C/DEU/CO/3-4, para. 80.
[3] See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 69.
[4] Ibid. See also CRC/C/DEU/CO/3-4, para. 80.
[5] See OHCHR, "Funding", in *OHCHR Report 2013*, pp. 131, 135, 165 and 167–169; *OHCHR Report 2014*, pp. 67, 96, 98 and 101–103; *OHCHR Report 2015*, pp. 61, 65, 94, 96, 99 and 100; and *OHCHR Report 2016*, pp. 78, 84, 110, 116 and 126.
[6] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.25, 124.27, 124.42, 124.57, 124.43–124.46 and 124.124.
[7] See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, paras. 72 and 74.
[8] Ibid., para. 71.
[9] See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 27–28.
[10] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.33, 124.64–124.116, 124.68, 124.69, 124.76–124.78, 124.70, 124.81, 124.85, 124.112, 124.113, 124.154, 124.111, 124.91, 124.107, 124.108 and 124.110.
[11] See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 75.
[12] See CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 16.
[13] See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 52.
[14] See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, para. 13.
[15] Ibid., para. 17.
[16] Ibid., para. 52.
[17] Ibid., para. 21.
[18] See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 25.
[19] Ibid., para. 78.
[20] See CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 7.
[21] Ibid., para. 9.
[22] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.198–124.200.
[23] See CRC/C/DEU/CO/3-4, paras. 22–23.
[24] See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 15–16.
[25] Ibid.
[26] See CRC/C/DEU/CO/3-4, paras. 22–23.
[27] Ibid., para. 21.
[28] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.123, 124.125, 124.127–124.130, 124.134, 124.144 and 124.188.
[29] See CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, paras. 33–34.
[30] See CAT/OP/DEU/1, para. 22; CAT/OP/DEU/2, para. 21. See also CAT/OP/DEU/1/Add.1 and CAT/OP/DEU/2/Add.1.
[31] See A/HRC/30/36/Add.1, para. 18.
[32] Ibid., paras. 22 and 26.
[33] Ibid., para. 75.
[34] Ibid., para. 76.
[35] See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 25–26.
[36] See CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 10.
[37] See CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, paras. 29–30.
[38] Ibid., paras. 37–38.
[39] See CED/C/DEU/CO/1, paras. 16–17.
[40] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.126.
[41] See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 51. See also CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 4.
[42] See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 61.
[43] Ibid., para. 53.
[44] Ibid., para. 61.
[45] Ibid., para. 76.
[46] See A/HRC/30/36/Add.1, paras. 15 and 91.
[47] Ibid., paras. 16 and 92.
[48] See CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, paras. 27–28.
[49] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.39, 124.40, 124.151, 124.168, 124.50, 124.152, 124.172, 124.149, 124.157 and 124.160.
[50] See UNESCO submission for the universal periodic review of Germany, paras. 5 and 19.
[51] See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, para. 31.
[52] See CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, paras. 9–10.

53 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.138–124.141 and 124.147.
54 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, para. 29.
55 See CRC/C/OPSC/DEU/CO/1, paras. 21–22.
56 For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.165.
57 See CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, para. 43.
58 See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 89.
59 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 35–36.
60 See CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 14.
61 See CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, para. 49.
62 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, para. 50.
63 See CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 12.
64 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 39–40.
65 Ibid., paras. 37–38.
66 See CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, para. 47.
67 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 37–38.
68 Ibid., para. 38.
69 For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.170.
70 See UNESCO submission, para. 1.
71 Ibid., paras. 14–16 and 18 (1).
72 Ibid., para. 15.
73 Ibid., paras. 17 and 18 (2).
74 See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 85.
75 Ibid., para. 86.
76 See CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 13.
77 Ibid., paras. 45–46.
78 See UNESCO submission, para. 18.
79 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.35, 124.36, 124.73, 124.133–24.136, 124.137, 124.158, 124.161–124.164, 124.119, 124.74 and 124.156.
80 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 23–24.
81 See CRC/C/DEU/CO/3-4, paras. 38–39.
82 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 25–26.
83 Ibid., para. 26.
84 See CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, paras. 15–16.
85 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.32, 124.37, 124.132 and 124.142.
86 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 23–24.
87 See CRC/C/OPSC/DEU/CO/1, para. 19.
88 Ibid., paras. 25–26.
89 Ibid., para. 35.
90 See CRC/C/DEU/CO/3-4, paras. 24–25.
91 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.173–124.178.
92 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 25–26.
93 See CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, paras. 35–36.
94 Ibid., paras. 13–14.
95 Ibid., paras. 23–24.
96 Ibid., para. 55.
97 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.56, 124.179, 124.192 and 124.180–124.182.
98 See CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 17.
99 See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 47.
100 Ibid., para. 66.
101 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.28, 124.31, 124.38, 124.184–124.187, 124.189–124.191 and 124.193–124.194.
102 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, para. 7.
103 See A/HRC/36/60/Add.2, para. 91.
104 See CRC/C/DEU/CO/3-4, para. 68.
105 See CEDAW/C/DEU/CO/7-8, paras. 33–34.
106 See A/HRC/30/36/Add.1, para. 89.
107 Ibid., para. 90.
108 See CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, para. 18.
109 For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.55.
110 See CRC/C/DEU/CO/3-4, para. 28.

United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/30/DEU/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
9 March 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirtieth session
7-18 May 2018

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Germany*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 23 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. DIMR stated that the Federal Republic of Germany revised its national sustainability strategy to implement the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). However, the SDGs were not linked to human rights, although Germany advocated for such link during the SDG negotiations.[2]

3. DIMR stated that there was a lack of effective oversight over the implementation of the national action plan on business and human rights adopted by the Federal Government.[3]

4. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the Universal Periodic Review of Germany (2013 review),[4] DIMR stated that the Federal Government adopted a national action plan to combat racism, which included homophobia and trans-phobia.[5]

5. Referring to relevant supported recommendations, DIMR stated that, in response to an attack on a Christmas market in Berlin on 19 December 2016, the Federal Legislator adopted counter-terrorism laws that provide for measures such as preventative detention and freedom of movement without judicial authorization, which were, were incompatible with human rights norms.[6] Furthermore, since 2015, there has been a significant expansion of

* This document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

GE.18-03681(E)

1803681

Please recycle

surveillance powers and powers to exchange personal data among authorities without careful examination of their actual benefit and proportionality.[7]

6. Referring to relevant supported recommendations, DIMR stated that the Federal and Länder Legislatures were yet to revise laws that foster the practice of racial profiling. Despite some initiatives, key steps to seriously combat the practice of racial profiling were yet to be taken.[8]

7. Referring to a relevant supported recommendations, DIMR stated that the Federal Legislator has explicitly made it an aggravating circumstance under the Penal Code where a criminal offence was racially motivated.[9]

8. DIMR stated that the committees of inquiry of the Bundestag and the parliaments of several of the Länder have examined the failure of the authorities to investigate the murders committed by the National Socialist Underground (NSU) and have made numerous recommendations for reforms, particularly regarding the police and the judiciary. However, there was no comprehensive and independent study of the actual implementation of the recommendations.[10]

9. DIMR stated that although Germany noted recommendations on the independent and effective investigation of suspected police misconduct, there were some positive developments.[11] About half of the federal states have made it mandatory for police officers to wear name or number tags making them identifiable, and have established independent police complaints bodies. However, the lack of institutional and hierarchal independence when investigating allegations of police misconduct remain.[12]

10. DIMR stated that in 2015, the Federal Legislator raised the age of legal capacity under asylum and residence law from 16 to 18 years.[13]

11. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, DIMR stated that in the vast majority of the Länder, mandatory school attendance did not apply to children living in reception centres, many of whom spent months in reception centres deprived of an education.[14] Equal opportunities for children with a migration background have not been achieved in the education system.[15]

12. DIMR stated at the 2013 review, Germany noted recommendations relating to the ban on religious attire, citing a decision of the Federal Constitutional Court of 24 September 2003.[16] However, in 2015, the Court ruled that a blanket ban on teachers wearing religious attire was impermissible,[17] leading to some federal states, amending their school laws or adopting measures to clarify the situation. In 2017, the federal legislator adopted a ban prohibiting the covering of faces by soldiers, civil servants and judges, as well as in the context of identify checks.[18]

13. Referring to a supported recommendation, DIMR stated that human rights was specified as a general educational objective in the school curricula in just 3 of the 16 federal states and their inclusion in the school curricula was largely only implicit. There was also a lack of systematic human rights education and training for professionals including judiciary, police and medical staff.[19]

14. DIMR stated that in the field of psychiatry, involuntary commitment, isolation, use of restraints, coerced administration of medication, as well as immobilization by sedation were legally permissible, pursuant to specified statutory exceptions. In practice the use of such methods were widespread and not administered in line with these exceptions.[20]

15. Referring to relevant supported recommendations, DiMR stated that persons with disabilities continued to suffer exclusion from the labour market.[21] Measures were introduced but it was early to assess their effectiveness.[22]

16. DIMR stated that it was essential for all state institutions providing child and youth services have to have independent complaints bodies in the form ombudspersons for child and youth services.[23]

17. DIMR stated that the measures introduced by the Federal Government to protect asylum seekers from violence in refugee accommodation facilities was only financed until the end of 2017. It called for the establishment of a statutory basis for these measures and for their further financing.[24]

18. DIMR noted the commencement of deliberations on the establishment of a data collections system on gender-related violence and stated that it was important that this system followed a human rights based approach.[25]

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[26] and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[27]

19. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, JS2 stated that Germany had ratified the Council of Europe Convention on the protection of children against sexual exploitation and sexual abuse. However, there remained a need for the reinforcement of child protection measures.[28]

20. Referring to relevant supported recommendations, GMB stated that Germany was dragging its feet on signing and ratifying OP-ICESCR.[29]

21. RSF-RWB saluted the German's decision to put its weight behind the initiative to create a United Nations Special Representative for the Safety of Journalists.[30]

22. GBM called on Germany to ensure that there will be proper follow-up to the recommendations that will be made during its upcoming universal periodic review.[31]

23. JS3 stated that although Germany had committed to submit a mid-term report two years after the 2013 review, a report was not submitted.[32]

B. National human rights framework[33]

24. JS1 called for the inclusion of sexual orientation and gender identity as grounds for discrimination in the Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Basic Law).[34]

25. GBM stated that by supporting a relevant recommendation,[35] Germany asserted that the indivisibility, universality and the interdependence of all human rights were guaranteed in legislation and practice. A bill to include social rights in the Basic Law has been submitted in the Bundestag and there was now an opportunity to make progress in incorporating the rights from ICESCR.[36]

26. BVT called for a revision of the transsexual legislation in order to make provision for a quick, transparent and accessible process of gender recognition based on self-determination.[37]

27. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, JS2 called on Germany to provide training to children on their human rights, as well as to those people working with children such as the police and those in the health sector.[38]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[39]

28. The CoE-Commissioner noted that the General Equal Treatment Act did not cover discrimination in the area of public law. He stated that Germany should ensure that victims of discrimination by public authorities were able to enjoy the protection provided by this Act.[40] CoE-ACFC recommended that Germany reviewing the General Equal Treatment Act to ensure effective protection against discrimination.[41]

29. JS4 stated that racist positions were not limited to right-wing extremists and were widely articulated in speeches, interviews, demonstrations, publications, electoral posters and on the internet. Stereotyping and prejudices were directed against Jews, Sinti and Roma, Muslims, refugees and migrants.[42]

30. The CoE-Commissioner urged the authorities and political leaders to condemn all instances of hate speech and hate crime, and to abstain from using rhetoric that stigmatises particular groups of the society. The use of hate speech and participation in racist activities should be a basis for serious, dissuasive disciplinary measures on members of parliaments and political parties.[43]

31. The CoE-Commissioner called a significantly broadened approach to combating racism, from one that focuses almost exclusively on the activities of extremist, and notably far-right organised groups to one that reflects the reality that racism often come from individuals not associated with these groups. Germany should also look into the extent to which structural forms of racism may be preventing law enforcement authorities from providing a professional service to Germany's minority groups.[44]

32. The CoE-Commissioner called for the strengthening and independence of the Antidiskriminierungsstelle des Bundes (Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency), with the ability to investigate complaints relating to discrimination, notably racial discrimination, and to file anti-discrimination lawsuits.[45] It should be obligatory for Federal Ministries to consult the Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency on all legislative, regulatory and other major projects with a bearing on groups protected by the General Equal Treatment Act.[46]

33. Recalling its recommendation from 2013, CoE-ECRI stated that it was regrettable that significant shortcomings remained in the recording and following up to racist, xenophobic, homophobic and transphobic incidents. The police continued to use incorrect terminology and an excessively restrictive definition of hate crime for their statistics.[47] AI also noted inadequacies in the recording of data on hate crime.[48]

34. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, JS4 stated that crime motivated by the sexual orientation of the victims were either not reported or if reported, were incorrectly classified under "other hate-motivated grounds" by the police.[49] LSVD stated that the different backgrounds and manifestations of hate crime based on sexual orientation, gender identity and expression and sex characteristics, directed against LGBTIQ* persons were ignored.[50]

35. LSVD stated that Section 46 (2) Sentence 2 of the Criminal Code was amended to ensure that hate motivation would play a greater role in determining penalties and to better inform investigations. While an express reference is made to racist motivation, other forms of hate crime are investigated on the basis of "other hate-motivated grounds". The omission of homophobic- and transphobic-motivated crime from the amended Section 46 (2) Sentence 2 of the Criminal Code was a deliberate, structural exclusion.[51] LSVD stated that a similar

problem existed with Section 130 of the Criminal Code, which identifies national, racial or religious groups or groups defined by ethnic origin as potential targets and makes no mention of LGBTIQ* persons and persons with disabilities.[52]

36. Referring to reports of ethnic and racial profiling by the police, particularly in the context of identity checks that target individuals mainly because of their race or ethnicity, AI stated that the law lacked sufficient safeguards against racial profiling and conferred wide powers on law enforcement officials to carry out identity checks.[53] The CoE-Commissioner called for the introduction of a reasonable-suspicion standard and strengthened training for law enforcement officers on conducting identity checks.[54]

37. LSVD stated that the national action plan against racism was not forwarding looking and sustainable. It marginalized LGBTIQ* persons, failed to offer any specific measures and remained non-committal.[55]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[56]

38. JS4 stated that the "Marshallplan with Africa" by the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development under the auspicious of the Official Development Assistance, which involved the private sector as key stakeholders to promote private investments in infrastructure projects, had insufficient safeguards in place to ensure protection of human rights.[57]

39. AccessNow stated that licenses had been granted to German companies to export surveillance technologies to about 25 countries, many of whom had a long history of human rights abuse.[58] JS4 called for the adoption of legislation imposing obligations on all German companies operating abroad to report on the measures in place to protect human rights.[59]

40. JS4 stated that Germany's mitigation policy and its long-term targets did not sufficiently correspond to its obligation to mitigate climate change. Furthermore, a central tenant of equity in the international climate change regime was to provide financial and technical support for the implementation of mitigation and adaptation policies in developing countries. However, Germany's contribution fell short of what was actually required.[60]

Human rights and counter-terrorism[61]

41. AI stated that in response to the attack in Berlin in December 2016,[62] far-reaching counter-terrorism measures had been adopted that violated the rights to a fair trial, to privacy, to freedom of movement and to liberty.[63]

42. Referring to relevant supported recommendations relating to counter-terrorism, ECCHR stated that since the 2013 review, Germany had facilitated the deployment of drones by a third country by allowing that country the use of the Ramstein airbase in Rheinland-Pfalz for such operations.[64] The drones were deployed in operations in six countries. In permitting the use of Ramstein airbase, Germany was complicit in violations of the right to life. Many of these strikes took place outside of any armed conflict where targeted killings were unlawful.[65]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[66]

43. AI expressed concern about the persistent barriers to impartial, independent and effective investigations into allegations of torture and other ill-treatment against the police due to the lack of independent investigation mechanisms or oversight bodies.[67] The CoE-Commissioner expressed the importance of establishing a full independent and well-functioning complaints mechanism covering all law enforcement officials.[68]

44. AI states that in seven Länder law enforcement officials remained under no obligation to wear identification badges. Also, the Federal authorities have not imposed any identification requirement on the Federal police.[69]

45. CoE-CPT noted there have been a number of cases in which criminal investigations against police officers for the alleged use of excessive force or other claims of ill-treatment had to be discontinued, as the police officers concerned could not be individually identified.[70] It called for necessary steps to ensure that police officers wearing masks or other attire that may hamper their identification were obliged to wear a clearly visible means of identification, such as a number on their uniform.[71]

46. The CoE-Commissioner opined that the National Agency for the Prevention of Torture was a "low-profile mechanism" and that Germany did not live up to the expectations derived from the ratification of OP-CAT.[72] CoE-CPT encouraged the authorities to review the functionalities of this Agency.[73] Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, AI stated that the Agency remained inadequately resourced and the procedure for the appointment of members lacked transparency and inclusion.[74]

47. CoE-CPT considered the maximum possible period of solitary confinement of four weeks for adult prisoners in various Länder prison laws to be excessive and that soliditary confinement should be lower than 14 days. Furthermore, solitary confinement should be abolished in respect of juveniles.[75]

48. CoE-CPT encouraged the police authorities of all Länder to take steps to ensure that all persons held in access of 24 hours were offered daily outdoor exercise.[76]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[77]

49. JS3 stated that the Federal Constitutional Court whose role it was to assess alleged human rights violations was inaccessible due to its increasingly complicated formal rules.[78]

50. JS3 stated that the slow process in cases involving family matters was tantamount to a denial of justice. Furthermore, the Jugendamt (Youth Welfare Office) was not bound by the decision of the family court.[79] Referring to relevant supported recommendations, JS3 stated that effective judicial control over administrative decisions of the Youth Welfare Office was not established and that nothing was done to implement those recommendations.[80]

51. AI expressed concern about the "shift to so-called pre-emptive justice", which granted wide-reaching powers to the police without any formal criminal charges, and cited as an example the new broad definition of "Gefährder" ("potential attacker"), which is used to justify human rights restrictions in various newly passed laws. The broad definition of "potential attacker" and the consequently applied administrative measures undermined the right to a fair trial, presumption of innocence and the principle of legality.[81]

52. CoE-CPT called on the Federal and Länder authorities to ensure that detained juveniles were not subjected to police questioning or were not required to sign any statement in the absence of a lawyer and, ideally, a trusted adult.[82] Furthermore, the authorities should ensure that all persons detained by the police have access to a lawyer throughout their police custody, including during any police questioning, if they so desired.[83]

53. The CoE-Commissioner called for the training of actors in the criminal justice system, including judges, on how to deal with racist offences, in light of the the amendment to the Penal Code introducing racist motivation as an aggravating circumstance of an offence.[84]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[87]

54. While noting that a new law providing for the marriage of same-sex couples came into effect, ADF called for legislative protections for the freedom of conscience in instances where same-sex marriage went against individual religious or moral beliefs.[88]

55. RSF-RWB stated that journalists continued to be threatened and harassed by right-wing groups and demonstrators, sometimes without an adequate police response.[89]

56. RSF-RWB stated that during the G20 Summit in July 2017, 32 journalists had their accreditation withdrawn, with the authorities citing security concerns as a reason. In at least 10 of those cases, the withdrawal of accreditation had been based on either false assumptions or illegally stored information in police databases. Furthermore, in four cases, the German Interior Ministry admitted that the decision to withdraw the accreditation was wrong.[90]

57. AccessNow stated that the Social Network Enforcement Act which was passed in June 2017, provided for the imposition of fines on social media platforms that failed to take down content labelled as hate speech, fake news or extremist. The law placed too high of a burden on social media companies. Moreover, the financial penalty encouraged companies to take an overly broad implementation and restrict legal but controversial speech in order to avoid fines.[91] RSF-RWB stated that the Act failed to provide guidelines on determining unlawful content and furthermore, the careless use of the term "punishable false news" in its explanatory statement, was questionable.[92]

58. RSF-RWB stated that the new statutory offence of "data fencing" ("Datenhehlerei"; section 202d of the Penal Code) penalizes the handling of leaked data without ensuring adequate protection for the media. The law thereby criminalizes an important part of the work of investigative journalists and bloggers, as well as of their sources and of experts assisting in their investigations.[93]

59. RSF-RWB stated that journalists faced the risk of surveillance by the *Bundesnachrichtendienst* (Federal Intelligence Service). In October 2016, a bill was passed empowering the Federal Intelligence Service to conduct surveillance on non-EU journalists.[94]

60. Referring to relevant supported recommendations,[95] JS4 noted the observations of CEDAW that there remained a number of structural barriers and discriminatory stereotypes making women disproportionately absent from decisions making positions in both elected and appointed positions in public office and within political parties, the judiciary and academia.[96]

61. OSCE-ODIHR stated that leading up to the 24 September 2017 election, concerns were expressed about equal campaign opportunities and campaign finance regulations.[97]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[98]

62. CoE-GRETA stated that Germany was a country of destination for victims of trafficking in persons, with the most prevalent form of exploitation of the identified victims being sexual exploitation.[97]

63. KOK called for the establishment of a human rights based approach to combating human trafficking, with the rights of trafficked persons being the centre of all relevant measures.[98]

64. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, JS2 stated that the definition of child trafficking was not in line with international standards.[99] Furthermore, the lack of research on child prostitution has hindered the implementation of measures addressing child prostitution. Some Länder did not provide counselling centres for victims.[100]

65. Referring to relevant supported recommendations, JS2 stated that there was no nationwide support systems for underage trafficked victims or potential victims.[101] JS4 made similar observations.[102] It added that the fight against human trafficking focused on criminal prosecution with the rights of victims often remaining secondary.[103]

66. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, JS2 stated that since the 2013 review, no work had been undertaken towards establishing a national referral mechanism for minor victims of trafficking.[104]

67. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, JS2 stated that as of 2017, there has been an improvement in access to justice for minor victims, which included access to a lawyer, and supported given during investigations and court testimony.[105]

68. CoE-GRETA called for continuation of regular training for all professionals who may encounter victims.[106] It urged Germany to strengthen multi-agency involvement in the identification of victims by giving a formal role in the identification process to frontline line actors including NGOs and labour inspectors,[107] and called for the introduction of identification and referral procedures for child victims,[108] as well as improved identification of victims among asylum seekers and irregular migrants in detention facilities.[109]

69. CoE-GRETA urged Germany ensure inter alia that assistance to victims was not made conditional on their willingness to testify.[110] Furthermore, Germany should ensure that victims benefit from a residence permit and the rights attached thereto, and that child victims were granted a residence permit based on their best interests and not on their willingness or ability to cooperate with judicial bodies.[111]

Right to privacy and family life[112]

70. AI stated that there was an increasing number of surveillance laws that failed to satisfy the requirements of proportionality and necessity. AI cited, as examples, the reintroduction of mandatory data retention by telecommunication providers, which it considers to be, in violation of the rights to privacy and freedom, and in 2016 the granting of the power to the Federal Intelligence Service to intercept, collect and process the communication of non-EU citizens outside Germany when the interception point is in Germany. AI expressed concern that in cases of extraterritorially conducted foreigner-to-foreigner surveillance, the Federal Intelligence Service may subject non-EU citizens to surveillance that was unregulated by law.[113]

71. AccessNow stated that in June 2017, a bill was passed allowing the government to hack into encrypted messaging services during criminal investigations. The new legislation permits use of spyware to infiltrate a suspect's device and read encrypted messages.[114]

72. In relation to family-related matters, JS3 stated that the rights of children and parents have been frequently violated, and the situation has deteriorated since the 2013 review. Furthermore, there was a campaign to introduce provisions in the Basic Law that will inter alia reinforce the position of the Youth Welfare Office as the self-appointed defender of the child, overriding the natural right of parents to bring up and educate their children.[115]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to social security

73. GBM recalled that in the 2013 review it had advocated for pension values in the eastern part of Germany to be gradually adjusted and brought in line with the pension values in the western part of the country. Commencing in 2025, pensions through out the country will be calculated the same way.[116]

Right to an adequate standard of living

74. GBM stated that studies have shown that the increasingly widening gap between the rich and the poor lead to inter alia the receptiveness to right-wing extremist, racist and xenophobic views in those parts of society severely threatened by poverty. All attempts at developing a viable strategy to lower the risk of poverty had proved to be ineffective.[115]

Right to health

75. CoE-CPT stated that during its visit, the delegation received a number of complaints of verbal abuse, threats and disrespectful behaviour by staff at Brandenburg and Wasserburg Forensic Psychiatric Clinics. Moreover, at Brandenburg Forensic Psychiatric Clinic, the delegation received allegations that some vulnerable patients were repeatedly subjected to physical and verbal abuse, as well as sexual harassment and exploitation. CoE-CPT expressed concern that in all psychiatric establishment visited patients under mechanical restraint (Fixierung) were not always subjected to continuous, direct and personal supervision by a member of the health-care staff (Sitzwache).[118]

76. BVT stated that Germany should introduce regulation to address the healthcare needs of people with gender-nonconforming identities.[119]

77. OII Germany stated that a lack of knowledge and prejudices of healthcare professionals and the policies of health insurance companies impaired access to general health care for intersex people.[120]

78. OII Germany stated that there was a lack of counselling services available to parents and families of intersex infants, children and adults.[121]

Right to education[122]

79. ADF stated that home education for children was illegal and exemption from conventional schooling was extremely rare. However, several hundred families continued to home educate their children, mostly due to their religious beliefs and values conflicting with the state curricula. Heavy sanctions were imposed on some parents for not enrolling their children in conventional schools, which included fines, imprisonment and the loss of custody of their children.[123]

80. OII Germany stated that intersex people were not included in any education curriculum. In addition, sex education did not include their existence or their bodily experience and instead, perpetuated the notion that only two sexes existed.[124]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[125]

81. JS7 stated that the Federal Government's National Action Plan on Security Council Resolution 1325, lacked a specific budget allocation that would ensure sufficient resources for its implementation. Furthermore, it neither included a monitoring mechanism nor concrete indicators for assessment of the Women, Peace and Security agenda; and civil society representatives were not included in the development, conceptualisation and drafting of the Plan.[126]

82. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, TDF stated that violence against women, especially domestic violence, remained a severe problem. The support system was overstretched, which lead to women being rejected by shelters. Also, with each Länder financing it own support system, difficulties arose when women from one Länder attempted to seek refuge in another Länder.[127]

83. TDF stated that migrant women affected by domestic violence who did not have an independent right to residence often did not separate from their husbands because of the fear of losing their residence title.[128]

Children[129]

84. JS4 stated that although the Federal Constitutional Court had recognized children as bearers of fundamental rights, children were not explicitly referred to in the Basic Law.[130]

85. JS1 stated that children should have the opportunity to actively participate in society and be able to influence the decisions that affect them.[131] It recommended that Germany lower the voting age to 14 years and continue to promote youth participation in political processes.[132]

Persons with disabilities[133]

86. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, JS4 stated that the unemployment rate was twice as high among persons with disabilities, with such persons being clearly disadvantaged in the labour market.[134]

Minorities and indigenous peoples[135]

87. CoE-ACFC recommended that Germany actively promote equality of Sinti and Roma in socio-economic life through targeted, evidence-based measures, designed, implemented and evaluated in full consultation with representatives of Sinti and Roma and based on clear benchmarks. Also recommended, were measures to address discrimination of Sinti and Roma children in the education system, including by ending the unjustified placement of Sinti and Roma children in special schools.[136]

88. CoE-ACFC recommended that Germany promote the effective participation of Sinti and Roma in public life, particularly at the political level.[137]

89. CoE-ACFC recommended that Germany continue to support the preservation and promotion of the cultures of national minorities. Additionally, Germany should increase support to media in minority languages; and fully implement the legislation in place to promote the use of minority languages.[138]

Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[139]

90. JS8 stated that legislation adopted in 2016 allowed for refugees and asylum seekers to be returned to a conflict region if one part of that region was deemed to be safe.[140] Also, persons with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and torture victims requiring specialised care could be deported to places where such care was not available.[141]

91. JS8 stated that Germany had no early identification system to identify torture survivors and special vulnerable people among the refugees.[142] The accelerated asylum procedures did not allow sufficient time for traumatised torture victims to disclose their torture.[143]

92. JS8 stated that the political discourse about refugees was fuelled by statements stigmatizing certain groups of refugees as being rapists or potential terrorists. Racist stigmatization of refugees became common in public and political discourse and inadequate steps were taken by the authorities to address this issue.[144]

93. Referring to relevant supported recommendations, JS2 stated the immigration legislation was not in full compliance with the CRC insofar as it related to minors who were victims of human trafficking. Furthermore, it negatively affected the best interests of the child.[145]

94. JS5 stated that the Residence Act and the Asylum Act provide for several grounds justifying immigration detention,[146] and it called on Germany to ensure, as a priority, that those grounds were clear and foreseeable in their application, in line with the requirements of lawfulness.[147]

95. JS5 noted the ruling of the Federal Constitutional Court that placement of foreigners at an airport transit zone, did not constitute detention,[148] and stated that, pursuant to a relevant judgment of the European Court of Human Rights, Germany should recognize that the confinement of asylum seekers at airport transit zones amounted to detention and ensure detention-related guarantees to those persons.[149]

96. While noting that the Residence Act provides that a non-citizen can only be placed in detention pursuant to detention order, JS5 stated that the quality of detention orders issued by the district courts was sometimes poor.[150] It called on Germany to ensure that judges issue detention orders based on the case-by-case examination of the individual circumstances, as required by the principle of necessity.[151]

97. The CoE-Commissioner invited Germany to develop nationwide obligatory minimum standards for the operation of reception facilities to ensure that reception conditions and services available to asylum seekers were in line with human rights standards throughout the country.[152]

98. While the CoE-Commissioner noted that because of the prioritised asylum procedures for nationals from a specified third country and for religious minorities from a specified third country, he was nevertheless concerned that applicants from other countries faced long delays in processing their claims.[153] He stated that all foreign nationals requesting asylum must have access to asylum procedures and their requests examined on a case-by-case basis in a rigorous and fair manner.[154]

99. The CoE-Commissioner stated that the Dublin Regulation – which requires an examination of whether another EU country was responsible for processing an asylum claim – overburdened the German administration and court system.[155] He called on Germany to take the lead in promoting the necessary steps to replace the Dublin Regulation with a more human rights orientated system.[156]

100. The CoE-Commissioner called for strengthened efforts to improve the integration of refugees. He urged Germany to ensure refugees had the right to family reunification.[157]

101. EUFRA stated because social services had a duty to report migrants in an irregular situation to the police if they had received non-emergency care, given the risk of being reported to the authorities the right to health care for those persons remained only on paper.[158]

Stateless persons[159]

102. JS6 stated that there was no dedicated statelessness determination procedure and the administrative procedures in place did not offer all the rights and protection stipulated by the 1954 Convention.[160]

103. JS6 stated that newly born children of refugee parents living in reception facilities and emergency shelters were not receiving birth certificates. Moreover, if the parents cannot produce the required documents, such as a marriage certificate, the child will only be registered with the mother's name on the birth certificate, which is problematic for refugees from a particular third country.[161]

104. JS6 stated that the nationality law lacked comprehensive safeguards to ensure otherwise children had access to nationality, with one of its limitations being the residence status requirement of the parents.[162]

The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status)

Civil society

Individual submissions:

AccessNow	Access Now, New York, United States of America;
ADF	ADF International, Geneva, Switzerland;
AI	Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
BVT	Bundesvereinigung Trans*, Berlin, Germany;
ECCHR	European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights, Berlin, Germany;
GBM	Gesellschaft zum Schutz von Bürgerrecht und Menschenwürde, Berlin, Germany;
KOK	German Network against Trafficking in Human Beings, Berlin, Germany;
LSVD	Lesbian and Gay Federation in Germany, Köln, Germany;
OII Germany	Internationale Vereinigung Intergeschlechtlicher Menschen / Organisation Intersex International Germany (OII Deutschland) e.V., Berlin, Germany;
RSF-RWB	Reporters Without Borders, Paris, France;
TDF	Terre Des Femmes, Berlin, Germany.

Joint submissions:

JS1	German Federal Youth Council and European Youth Forum, Berlin, Germany (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	ECPAT Germany, Freiburg, Germany and ECPAT International, Bangkok, Thailand (Joint Submission 2);
JS3	Coalition of Family related NGOs for UPR of Germany comprising of Trennungsväter e.V., Forum Soziale Inklusion e.V., Väteraufbruch für Kinder, MANNdat e.V., Aucrback, Germany (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	FORUM MENSCHENRECHTE, Berlin, Germany; in cooperation with: ACAT Deutschland, Brot für die Welt, Bundesverband unbegleiteter minderjährige Flüchtlinge (BUMF), Bundesweite AG der Psychosozialen Zentren für Flüchtlinge und Folteropfer (BAFF), German NGO Network against Trafficking in Human Beings (KOK), Deutsche Kommission Justitia et Pax, Deutscher Frauenrat, FIAN Deutschland e.V., Diakonie Deutschland – Evangelischer Bundesverband, European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights (ECCHR), Gemeinschaft für Menschenrechte im Freistaat Sachsen e.V. (GMS), Germanwatch, Gesellschaft für bedrohte Völker, Humanistische Union (HU), Human Rights Watch Germany, Humboldt Law Clinic: Grund- und Menschenrechte, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), German Section, Physicians in Social Responsibility, Refugio Munich, Intersexuelle Menschen e.V., Lesben- und Schwulenverband in Deutschland (LSVD), Kindernothilfe, MISEREOR, Nuremberg Human Rights Centre, Pro Asyl, Reporters without Borders German Section, TERRE DES FEMMES, terre des hommes, Vereinte Evangelische Mission (VEM), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom German Section (WILPF);
JS5	The Global Detention Project, Geneva, Switzerland and Jesuit

	Refugee Service.
JS6	Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion, Eindhoven, Netherlands and European Network on Statelessness.
JS7	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Geneva, Switzerland and Internationale Frauenliga für Frieden und Freiheit (IFFF), WILPF Germany.
JS8	International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims, Copenhagen, Denmark and MFH Bochum, Germany.
National human rights institution	
DIMR	German Institute for Human Rights, Berlin, Germany.
Regional intergovernmental organization(s)	
CoE	Council of Europe, Strasbourg, Cedex, France. Council Of Europe - European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Report to the German Government on the visit to Germany carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 25 November 2015 to 7 December 2015, CPT/Inf (2017) 13 (CoE-CPT). Council of Europe – Commissioner for Human Rights. Report by Nils Muižnieks, Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe following his visit to Germany on 24th April and from 4 to 8 May 2015, CommDH(2015)20 (CoE-Commissioner). Council of Europe – European Commission against Racism and Intolerance. ECRI conclusions on the Implementation of the Recommendations in respect of Germany Subject to Interim Follow-up. Adopted on 8 December 2016 (CoE-ECRI). Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. Fourth Opinion on Germany adopted on 19 March 2015, ACFC/OP/IV(2015)003 (CoE-ACFC). Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. Report concerning the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Germany, First evaluation round. Adopted 20 March 2015, GRETA(2015)10 (CoE-GRETA). Group of States against Corruption. Fourth Evaluation Round. Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors. 24 March 2017 (CoE-GRECO).
EUFRA	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, Vienna, Austria.
OSCE-ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights/Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw, Poland.

[2] DIMR, para. 23.
[3] *Ibid*, para. 18.
[4] See the Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, Germany, A/HRC/24/9.
[5] DIMR, para. 9 and endnote 27, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.52 (Kazakhstan). See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on the recommendation.
[6] *Ibid*, para 12 and endnote 39, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124. 198 (Mexico) and 124.199 (Pakistan). See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on the recommendations.
[7] *Ibid*, para. 13.
[8] *Ibid*, para. 8. See also JS4, para. 30.
[9] *Ibid*, para. 7 and endnote 21, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124. 33 (Estonia) and 124.41 (Islamic Republic of Iran). See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on the recommendations.
[10] *Ibid*, para. 7.

11 *Ibid.* para. 11 and endnote 36, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.127 (Botswana) and 124.128 (Hungary) and 124.130 (Netherlands). See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on the recommendations.

12 *Ibid.* para. 11.

13 *Ibid.* para. 2.

14 *Ibid.* para. 3 and endnote 6, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.170 (Chile). See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on the recommendation.

15 *Ibid.* para. 4 and endnote 12, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.116 (Djibouti) See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on the recommendation.

16 *Ibid.* para. 10 and endnote 29, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.39 (Bangladesh), 124.40 (Jordon), 124.109 (Kuwait), 124.172 (Pakistan). See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on those recommendations.

17 See *Ibid.* endnote 30 which refers to Federal Constitutional Court, decision of 27.01.2015, case nos. 1 BvR 471/10, 1 BvR 1181/10, http://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de/SharedDocs/Entscheidungen/DE/2015/01/rs20150127_1bvr047110.html. The Court held that a ban is possible only as a last resort if a concrete risk of jeopardizing school peace or of interference with state neutrality is established. See also EUFRA, p. 6.

18 *Ibid.* para. 10.

19 *Ibid.* para. 14 and endnote 44, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.169 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on the recommendation.

20 *Ibid.* para. 15.

21 *Ibid.* para. 17 and endnote 55, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.173 (Peru) and 124.174 (Austria) See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on those recommendations.)

22 *Ibid.* para. 17.

23 *Ibid.* para. 19.

24 *Ibid.* para. 20.

25 *Ibid.* para. 21.

26 The following abbreviations have been used in this report:

ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child.

27 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.1-124. 124.26, 124.30, 124.49 and 126.63.

28 JS2, para. 11, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.24 (Liechtenstein). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on this recommendation. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 27 and 28).

29 GBM, para. 4, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.11 (Sierra Leone), 124.12 (Ecuador), 124.13 (Portugal), 124.18 (Spain) 124.19 (Uruguay), 124. 20 (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and 124.21 (France). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on this recommendation.

30 RSF-RWB, p. 4.

31 GBM, para. 9.

32 JS3, p. 3.

33 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.25, 124.27, 124.42, 124.57, 124.43-124.46, 124.124.

34 JS1, p. 8.

35 The recommendations reads "Adopt measures to recognize in practice the indivisibility, equality, interdependence and universality of all human rights so that legislation and judicial practice adequately ensures the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights and not just civil and political rights (Ecuador)".

36 GBM, para. 3.

37 BVT, para. 11.

38 JS2, paras. 9 and 10, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.32 (Togo). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for

Germany's position on this recommendation. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 27 and 28).

[39] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.33, 124.64 -124.116, 124.68, 124.69, 124.76 - 124.78, 124.70, 124.81, 124.85, 124.112, 124.113, 124.154, 124.111, 124.91, 124.107, 124.108, 124.110.

[40] CoE-Commissioner, paras. 152 and 195.

[41] CoE-ACFC, p. 41.

[42] JS4, para. 12.

[43] CoE-Commissioner, para. 191.

[44] *Ibid*, paras. 148, 149 and 189.

[45] *Ibid*, paras. 29 and 69.

[46] *Ibid*, para. 30.

[47] CoE-ECRI, pp. 5-6.

[48] AI, pp. 4-5. AI made recommendations (p. 8).

[49] JS4, para. 40, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.122 (Norway). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on this recommendation.

[50] LSVD, p. 3. LSVD made recommendations (pp.6-7).

[51] *Ibid*, pp. 2-3. See also JS4, pars. 40 and 41.

[52] *Ibid*, p. 3. LSVD made recommendations (pp. 6-7).

[53] AI, pp. 5-6.

[54] CoE-Commissioner, paras. 170 and 194.

[55] LSVD, p. 6. LSVD made recommendations (pp. 6-7).

[56] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.198- 124.200.

[57] JS4, para. 14.

[58] AccessNow, para. 14.

[59] JS4, paras. 16 and 17.

[60] *Ibid*, paras. 26 and 27.

[61] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.199, 124.200.

[62] On 19 December 2016, a man drove a truck through a Christmas market in Berlin, killing 12 people and injuring more than 50 people (AI, fn. 23).

[63] AI, p. 3.

[64] ECCHR, paras. 2 and 3, and referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.198 (Mexico), 124.199 (Pakistan) and 124.200 (Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on those recommendations.

[65] *Ibid*, paras. 10 and 11. ECCHR made recommendations (paras. 13 and 14). See also JS4, paras. 24 and 25.

[66] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.123, 124.125, 124.127-124.130, 124.134, 124.144 and 124.188.

[67] AI, p. 5. AI made recommendations (p.8).

[68] CoE-Commissioner, paras. 41 and 71. See also CoE-CPT, para. 19, and JS4, para. 31.

[69] AI, p. 5. AI made recommendations (p. 8).

[70] CoE-CPT, para. 21.

[71] *Ibid*, para. 22.

[72] CoE-Commissioner, para. 36.

[73] CoE-CPT, para. 11.

[74] AI, p. 1, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.43. See p. 7 for recommendations made by AI.

[75] CoE-CPT, p. 7.

[76] *Ibid*, para. 32.

[77] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, 124.126.

[78] JS3, p. 9.

[79] *Ibid*, p. 9.

[80] JS1, pp. 2-3, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.49 (Poland), 124.145 (Turkey) and 124.146 (Bangladesh). See A/HRC/24/9/Add. 1 for the Germany's position on those recommendations. JS3 made recommendations (p. 11).

[81] AI, p. 3. AI made recommendations (pp.8-9).

[82] CoE-CPT, para. 26.

[83] *Ibid*, para. 28.

[84] CoE-Commissioner, para. 190.

[85] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.39, 124.40, 124.151, 124.168, 124.50,

124.152, 124.172, 124.149, 124.157, 124.160.

[86] ADF, paras. 3-7. ADF made a recommendation (para. 27 (a)).

[87] RSF-RWB, p. 1.

[88] *Ibid*, pp. 1-2.

[89] AccessNow, para. 9.

[90] RSF-RWB, p. 3. RSF-RWB made a recommendation (p.4).

[91] *Ibid*, p. 2. RSF-RWB made a recommendation (p. 4).

[92] *Ibid*, p. 3.

[93] JS4, para. 38, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.71 (Norway), 124.72 (Republic of Moldova), 124.73 (Republic of Molvova), 124.74 (Djibouti), 124.75 (Paraguay) and 124.156 (India). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's positions on those recommendations.

[94] RSF-RWB, pp. 3-4. RSF-RWB made a recommendation (p. 4).

[95] OSCE-OHHR, p. 2.

[96] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124. 138 - 124. 141, 124.147.

[97] CoE-GRETA, paras. 10 and 11.

[98] KPK, p. 6.

[99] JS2, paras. 9 and10, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.37 (Costa Rica). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on this recommendation.

[100] *Ibid*, paras. 14 and 15, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.142 (Belarus). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on this recommendation. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 27 and 28).

[101] *Ibid*, para. 17, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.139 (Cambodia), 124.140 (Costa Rica), and 124.141 (India). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on those recommendations.

[102] JS4, para. 28.

[103] *Ibid*, para. 29 referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.141 (India) and 124.147 (Greece). For Germany's position on those recommendations see A/HRC/24/9/Add.1.

[104] JS2, para. 16, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.138 (Liechtenstein). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on this recommendation. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 27 and 28).

[105] *Ibid*, para. 18, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.147 (Greece). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on this recommendation. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 27 and 28).

[106] CoE-GRETA, para. 79.

[107] *Ibid*, para. 137.

[108] *Ibid*, para. 137.

[109] *Ibid*, para. 138.

[110] *Ibid*, para. 150.

[111] *Ibid*, paras. 169-171.

[112] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.165.

[113] AI, pp. 2-3 and fn. 22. AI made recommendations (p.8). See also AccessNow, para.15. AccessNow made recommendations (p. 6). CoE-Commissioner, para. 75.

[114] AccessNow, para. 13. AccessNow made recommendations (p. 6).

[115] JS3, p. 6.

[116] GBM, para. 6.

[117] *Ibid*, para. 8.

[118] CoE-CPT, p. 8.

[119] BVT, para. 12.

[120] OII Germany, p. 4. OII Germany made recommendations (p. 5). See also AI, p. 7. AI made recommendations (p. 9).

[121] *Ibid*, p. 6. OII Germany made recommendations (p. 6).

[122] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.170.

[123] ADF, paras. 19.

[124] OII Germany, p. 7. OII Germany recommendations (p. 7).

[125] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.35, 124.36, 124.73, 124.133- 24.136, 124.137, 124.158, 124.161 - 124.164, 124.119, 124.74, 124.156.

[126] JS7, paras. 1-3. JS7 made recommendations (para. 6).

[127] TDF, pp. 1-2, referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124. 137 (Slovakia). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on this recommendation. See also JS4, para. 37.

[128] TDF, p. 2.

[129] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.32, 124.37, 124.132, 124.142.

[130] JS4, para. 44.

[131] JS1, p. 4.
[132] *Ibid.* p. 7.
[133] For relevant recommendations see a/hrc/24/9, paras. 124.173-124. 178.
[134] JS4, para. 55 referring to A/HRC/24/9, para. 124.173 (Peru).
[135] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.56, 124.179, 124.192, 124.180-124.182.
[136] CoE-ACFC, p. 41.
[137] *Ibid.* p. 42.
[138] *Ibid.* pp. 41-42.
[139] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.28, 124.31, 124.38, 124.186, 124.184, 124.187, 124.189, 124.190, 124.193, 124.194, 124.185, 124.191.
[140] JS8, p. 2.
[141] *Ibid.* p. 3.
[142] *Ibid.* p. 2. JS8 made a recommendation (p. 2).
[143] *Ibid.* p. 4. JS8 made recommendations (p. 4).
[144] *Ibid.* p. 5. JS8 made a recommendation (p.5).
[145] JS2, paras. 23 – 26, referring to A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.38 (Estonia), 124.183 (Nigeria), 124.194 (Belarus) and 124.197 (France). See A/HRC/24/9/Add.1 for Germany's position on those recommendations. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 27 and 28). See also JS4, para. 11.
[146] For the grounds justifying immigration detention, as articulated by JS5, see p. 4.
[147] JS5, pp. 4 and 9.
[148] *Ibid.* p. 4 and footnote 16, referring to Bundesverfassungsgericht, judgment, 14 May 1996, 2 BvR 1516/93.
[149] *Ibid.* pp. 4 and 9, and footnote 17, referring to *Amuur v. France*, European Court of Human Rights, judgment, 25 June 1996, 17/1995/523/609.
[150] *Ibid.* p. 6.
[151] *Ibid.* p. 9.
[152] CoE-Commissioner, para. 140.
[153] *Ibid.* paras. 87 and 88.
[154] *Ibid.* para. 138.
[155] *Ibid.* paras. 92 and 93. See also JS4, para. 62.
[156] *Ibid.* para. 139.
[157] *Ibid.* paras. 146 and 147.
[158] EUFRA, p. 26.
[159] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/9, paras. 124.55.
[160] JS6, para. 9. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 30 (ii)).
[161] *Ibid.* paras 24 and 25. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 30(iii)).
[162] *Ibid.* para. 28. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 30 (iv)).